DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 654 SP 028 141

AUTHOR Feiman-Nemser, Sharon; Buchmann, Margret
TITLE When Is Student Teaching Teacher Education? Research Series No. 178.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 86
CONTRACT 400-81-0014
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Learning Processes; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; Teacher Education Programs; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a conceptual framework that relates empirical aspects of student teaching (facts about the experience) to considerations of value (what student teachers ought to learn). First, the report explains what is meant by calling student teaching an "occasion for teacher learning." Next, based on observational and interview data, two cases of student teaching are presented to illustrate how the relative influence of program, setting, and participants interact to shape opportunities for teacher learning. One teaching episode that elicited considerable pride in each student teacher is presented to highlight how and what the student teachers learned. The conclusion appraises the lessons learned in student teaching in terms of the framework and suggests how teacher educators can increase the educative power of the student teaching experience. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Research Series No. 178

WHEN IS STUDENT TEACHING TEACHER EDUCATION?

Sharon Feiman-Nemser and
Margret Buchmann

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Feiman-Nemser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Research Series No. 178

WHEN IS STUDENT TEACHING TEACHER EDUCATION?

Sharon Feiman-Nemser and
Margret Buchmann

Published by

The Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

September 1986

This work is sponsored in part by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or the Department. (Contract No. 400-81-0014).

Institute for Research on Teaching

The **Institute for Research on Teaching** was founded at Michigan State University (MSU) in 1976 by the National Institute of Education. Following a nationwide competition in 1981, the NIE awarded a second five-year contract to MSU. Funding is also received from other agencies and foundations for individual research projects.

The IRT conducts major research projects aimed at improving classroom teaching, including studies of classroom management strategies, student socialization, the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties, and teacher education. IRT researchers are also examining the teaching of specific school subjects such as reading, writing, general mathematics, and science and are seeking to understand how factors outside the classroom affect teacher decision making.

Researchers from such diverse disciplines as educational psychology, anthropology, sociology, and philosophy cooperate in conducting IRT research. They join forces with public school teachers who work at the IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, analyze and interpret results, and disseminate findings.

The IRT publishes research reports, occasional papers, conference proceedings, a newsletter for practitioners, and lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, and/or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the IRT Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-Directors: Jere E. Brophy and Andrew C. Porter

Associate Directors: Judith E. Lanier and Richard S. Prawat

Editorial Staff
Editor: Sandra Gross
Assistant Editor: Sally B. Pratt

Abstract

This paper presents a conceptual framework that relates empirical aspects of student teaching (facts about the experience) to considerations of value (what student teachers ought to learn). First, the authors explain what they mean by calling student teaching an "occasion for teacher learning." Next, based on their observational and interview data, the authors present two cases of student teaching to illustrate how the relative influence of program, setting, and participants interact to shape opportunities for teacher learning. One teaching episode that elicited considerable pride in each student teacher is presented to highlight how and what the student teachers learned. The conclusion appraises the lessons learned in student teaching in terms of the framework and suggests how teacher educators can increase the educative power of the student teaching experience.

WHEN IS STUDENT TEACHING TEACHER EDUCATION?[1]

Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Margret Buchmann[2]

What kind of occasion for teacher learning is student teaching? How do interactions among the classroom setting, professional program, and participants shape opportunities to learn and learning outcomes? How do the nature and timing of student teaching affect what teacher candidates learn and how are they impressed by it? Do we want student teachers to learn the things they are learning? What needs to be done to make student teaching teacher education?

In this paper we consider these questions, in detail, for two prospective teachers enrolled in contrasting teacher education programs. Our purpose is to describe and analyze what kind of occasion for learning student teaching offered these individuals, to appraise the content and significance of the lessons they learned, and to discuss what teacher educators and policymakers can learn from these cases. To accomplish these goals of description, analysis, and appraisal, we present a conceptual framework that allows us to relate empirical aspects of student teaching to considerations of value (Scheffler, 1985). By empirical aspects we mean certain structural givens, such as the placement of student teaching at the end of formal preparation, and relevant characteristics of programs, settings, and persons. By

---

[1]A version of this paper was presented under the title "On What Is Learned in Student Teaching: Appraising the Experience" at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985.

[2]Sharon Feiman-Nemser is coordinator of the Knowledge Use in Learning to Teach Project and associate professor of teacher education at Michigan State University. Margret Buchmann, also an associate professor of teacher education at MSU, is a senior researcher on the project and coordinator of the Conceptual Analytic Project. The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge Deborah Ball for her helpful comments on earlier drafts.

considerations of value, we mean what student teachers ought to learn and what sort of instruction that requires. We offer a conception of the central tasks of teaching and teacher education.

The paper has three parts. First, we explain what we mean by calling student teaching "an occasion for teacher education and learning." Second, we present two stories of student teaching that illuminate the relative influence of program, setting, and participants in determining opportunities to learn and learning outcomes. To preserve the integrity of the case material, we present them sequentially. Finally, we discuss the lessons learned in terms of our framework and describe how teacher educators can increase the educative power of student teaching.

Structural Givens

Student teaching holds promise for helping beginners learn because it is experiential; that is, it offers a chance to teach under guidance, to watch an experienced teacher close up and to find out how he or she thinks about teaching, to get to know children and how they think, to discover what it "feels like" to be in charge of a class. These possibilities for learning derive from the fact that student teaching is an extended, firsthand encounter with teaching in someone else's classroom. Of course, the experiential nature of student teaching can also be a source of problems. Student teachers are not strangers to classrooms. Familiarity with classrooms and teachers may prevent beginners from searching beyond what they already know and from questioning the practices they see. In teacher preparation, experience is a trusted though not always reliable teacher (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985).

Student teaching also has salience for prospective teachers and teacher educators because it comes at the end of formal preparation, serving as an

occasion to evaluate whether or not the novice is ready to teach. Less obvious is the fact that student teaching can be a beginning, that lays foundations for future learning (Feiman-Nemser, 1983). Prospective teachers are in a position to start learning from teaching, under guidance, and to see that some of the knowledge they need is "local": It can only be derived from interactions with particular students over time.

The Influence of Persons, Programs, and Settings

Participants, settings, and programs all help shape student teaching as an occasion for teacher learning (Zeichner, 1985). Student teachers have particular understandings and dispositions that influence their approaches to the experience and their capacities to learn from it. Social and intellectual skills, as well as expectations about themselves, influence their work. The classrooms in which student teachers work affect the boundaries and directions of what can be learned through their characteristic interactions and curricula. Cooperating teachers set the affective and intellectual tone and also shape what student teachers learn by the way they conceive and carry out their role as teacher educators. School ethos and faculty norms may be sources of influence as well. Finally, professional programs aim to teach future teachers knowledge and skills. To identify program influences, we must know what was taught and learned in professional courses prior to student teaching. We can also look at university supervisors as representatives of program commitments during the experience.

Central Tasks of Teaching and Teacher Preparation

What distinguishes teaching from other helping professions is a concern with helping people learn worthwhile things in the social context of classrooms. Whatever else teachers do, they are supposed to impart knowledge and

see that pupils learn (Wilson, 1975; Hogan, 1983; Buchmann, 1984). To promote learning, teachers must know things worth teaching, consider what is important, and find ways to help students acquire understandings. Since teachers cannot observe learning directly, they must learn to detect signs of understanding or confusion, feigned interest or genuine absorption (Dewey, 1904/1965).

Because teachers work with groups of students, they must consider the needs of many individuals as they orchestrate the social and intellectual sides of classroom life. Good teachers at their best moments manage both sides together, whereas novices usually cannot give them equal attention at the same time. By concentrating on the interactive side alone, however, student teachers may learn to manage pupils and classrooms without learning what it takes to promote learning. Teaching, in sum, requires knowledge of subject matter, persons, and pedagogy. It demands principled and strategic thinking about ends, means, and their consequences. Most important, it requires interactive skills and serious commitment to foster student learning.

Pedagogical Thinking and Acting.

Whereas the lengthy personal experience of schooling provides prospective teachers with a repertoire of beliefs and behavior to draw from, this "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975) does not prepare them for the central tasks of teaching. Looking at teaching from the perspective of a pupil is not the same as viewing it from a pedagogical perspective, that is, the perspective of a teacher. Prospective teachers must learn to look beneath the familiar, interactive world of schooling and focus on student thinking and learning. Perhaps most difficult is learning to shift attention from themselves as teachers or the subjects they are teaching to what <u>others</u> need to

learn. In The Art of Teaching, Highet (1966) describes what this shift entails:

> You must think, not what you know, but what they do not know; not what you find hard, but what they will find hard; then, after putting yourself inside their minds, obstinate or puzzled, groping or mistaken as they are, explain what they need to learn. (p. 280)

There is a big difference between going through the motions of teaching--checking seatwork, talking at the board, assigning homework--and connecting these activities to what pupils should be learning over time. Helping prospective teachers recognize that difference and laying the groundwork for the orientations and skills of pedagogical thinking and acting are central tasks of teacher preparation.

Introducing the Student Teaching Cases

The concrete meaning and challenge of these tasks will become clear as we report on the experiences of two student teachers enrolled in programs with contrasting structures and ideologies. The data are part of a larger study concerning what is taught and learned in teacher preparation.[3] Susan was a student in the Academic Program, which emphasized the importance of theoretical and subject matter knowledge and provided limited field experiences prior to student teaching. Molly was a student in the Decision-Making Program, which emphasized generic methods of teaching and research-based decision

---

[3]Between 1982-84, we followed six elementary education students through two years of undergraduate teacher education. The students were enrolled in two contrasting programs that are part of a major effort to reform the preservice curriculum. Each term we interviewed students about what they were learning in their courses and field experiences and how they thought that would help them in teaching and learning to teach. The interviews were grounded in systematic observations of core courses and field experiences in both programs. During student teaching, each student teacher was paired with one researcher who made weekly visits to observe and document the student teacher's activities. We also kept notes of informal conversations with the student teachers, their cooperating teachers, and university supervisors and conducted formal interviews before and after the experience.

making and offered different kinds of field experiences throughout formal preparation.

The cases which follow have a common format. First, we describe what each student teacher expected from student teaching. Then we sketch personal qualities in the student teacher and aspects of the program and setting that shaped their experiences and the impact. In these stories, we show how student teaching became a particular kind of occasion for teacher learning by illustrating how the three factors of person, program, and setting interacted over time. Finally, we examine in detail one teaching episode that elicited considerable pride in each student teacher. These prideful occasions not only highlight what and how these student teachers learned but also strengthen our basis for appraising the experiences in terms of the central tasks of teaching and teacher preparation.

The Case of Susan

Goals and Expectations

Considered by her instructors one of the strongest students in the Academic Program, Susan looked forward to student teaching with eagerness. "Finally," she said, "I'll be getting out and doing something practical." Like many teachers, Susan believed that "actual concrete experience" was "more valuable than all the reading and discussion and everything that can take place on a topic" (p. 37).[4] Whereas the Academic Program recommended five weeks of full-time responsibility, Susan said, "I want to do it for at least seven" (p. 34). At the same time, Susan recognized the need for someone to observe her, to offer guidance, and to stimulate reflection. She

---

[4]The numbers refer to pages in the data set for each student. All the names are pseudonyms.

considered student teaching a kind of internship, a time to try out ideas about good teaching under supervision:

> You can't take someone and have them learn all the aspects of good teaching and then say, "Go out and teach," without giving them an opportunity to try it out, to have someone to give them feedback and guidance, and then to go back again and look at it in retrospect. (p. 34)

Susan wanted a chance to plan lessons in all the content areas and to be responsible for pupils' learning over time. She recognized that these instructional responsibilities would differ from the experience of planning and teaching "one-shot lessons" to a reading group, as she had done in conjunction with her reading practicum. There she only needed a single objective and did not have to worry about where her lesson was leading. Now, however, she said,

> I have to be very aware of what I'm doing and where I'm going and of the time that's spent in each of the times, for, maybe, math, for reading, for science, that sort of thing. I've never really gone through a day where I teach each of these things . . . and I need experience with that. (p. 29-30)

Susan was hoping "to learn by doing," by getting experience. But she also saw student teaching as a testing period for herself, as a person, and for her choice of a career:

> Just being in the classroom . . . is going to be a big, I don't want to say shock, but that's going to be a big part of what student teaching is about--to know whether or not you can handle those kids, to know whether or not you actually want to do this for the rest of your life. (pp. 35-36)

Susan's entering goals and expectations referred both to the knowledge and the interactive dimensions of teaching, and both these elements were reflected in her image of a good teacher. According to Susan, a good teacher never has to raise her voice. She "has excellent things going on but there's no chaos" (p. 33). Susan described an idealized picture of an orderly classroom where pupils were busy and happy learning through "fun" activities and where the teacher was liked and respected. She was vague about what she

meant by good classroom management (not "heavy handed") and innovative activities ("not boring seatwork"). Although her ideal included a commitment to foster learning, getting respect was very important to her:

> I've always wanted ever since I started the program to be a teacher that my students would love, respect, and look back on . . . That was the ideal image of a teacher in my mind. Someone who really taught them a lot, and yet they really respected and loved her for the things that she put forth for them, and her attitude and actions, that sort of thing (132).

Program Influences

Prior to student teaching, Susan had begun to incorporate the major themes of the Academic Program into her ways of thinking about teaching. Most striking was her belief that she had started to "think like a teacher." In describing her work with a reading group (in conjunction with the reading practicum), she revealed concerns and expectations about student thinking and learning that her program stressed:

> I'm trying to make the kids connect what they're doing with something they should be learning. I don't want them to just read and then sit down and close the book without thinking about "Why did we read this story? What did I get out of it? What's it saying to me? What good has it done me?"--that sort of thing. (p. 8)

Susan seemed to feel that doing schoolwork was not enough. She wanted students to think about the reasons for doing it, what they were learning, and what that meant to them as persons.

Susan credited the reading professor for showing her how to foster these attitudes by taking over her reading group and modeling what can be done even with the stories in the basal reader. His demonstrations of teaching to foster understanding and personal meaning made a big impression on Susan because they provided concrete models of the Academic Program's commitment. She said that this professor had really started to "press that into us" and she looked forward to working with him during student teaching. The Academic

Program provided specialists in subject matter to supervise her. In addition to her reading professor, Susan was also supervised by a science educator.

Susan's notion of learning through "fun" activities captured her interpretation of another message in the Academic Program: Good teachers do not rely on textbooks. She translated this message into a dichotomy between "meaningful" learning activities, usually created by the teacher, and "boring" seatwork, usually based on workbooks and dittos. Susan wrote in her student teaching application that she wanted to "get away from textbooks and learn to use the community as a resource" (p. 45).

Cooperating Teacher and Setting

Susan had a cooperating teacher who exemplified many of the commitments of the Academic Program. Bob taught science and reading to a combined third/fourth-grade class composed largely of children from professional families; he teamed up with the teacher next door for math and social studies. Bob involved his students in projects and was especially skillful at giving clear explanations, asking challenging questions, and probing students' thinking. His expertise came out in large and small ways. He seemed to know when to persist and when to tell a student, "I'll let you think about that" or "Let's leave it; we can't agree today" (p. 49).

Once, after Susan showed a film on longitude and latitude, Bob stimulated a lively exchange by asking the class: "What kinds of workers need to know about time zones?" Bob typically asked application questions that could be answered in several ways. The children's suggestions--businessmen, travel agents, pilots (p. 82)--showed that they had understood the concepts. Susan had never imagined opening up the discussion in such a way and was impressed that the students had so many different ideas.

Although he had never had a student teacher before, Bob chose Susan because he liked what she had written in her student teaching application. He encouraged her to set aside the basal to teach story elements and he asked her to plan a field trip to a local television station. Overall, Bob gave Susan a great deal of responsibility, but he did not talk much about his own teaching or hers. For example, toward the end of student teaching, Susan and Bob each taught a science lesson on rectangular grids to half the class, but they approached the topic in different ways. Whereas Bob presented the rectangular grid as a "system," a central concept in the science curriculum, Susan treated the topic of rectangular grids as a follow-up to the unit on polar coordinates that had just finished teaching. Having no comprehensive view of the science curriculum, Susan was unaware that "system" was a unifying theme.

Despite these differences in treatment, Bob and Susan never discussed what each did and why. Susan found Bob somewhat aloof. She said he did not respect the other teachers at this suburban school even though they held him in high regard.

Susan the Person

Susan was rather shy. Describing herself before she transferred to the university, Susan said: "I was a very nice person, but a very quiet person" (p. 140). Over the course of her junior and senior years in college, Susan became noticeably more self-confident. She attributed that change to her job as a dorm receptionist which gave her "a great big boost": "Now I'm not just another person. . . . I'm somebody there, I can help. . . . I don't feel like an outsider. I feel like I'm one of the insiders now" (p. 2). Susan had a strong need to be noticed, to count as someone special. When the "guys" in the dorm where her fiance worked as a resident advisor included her

in their thank-you letter at the end of the year, Susan was touched: "I never had that kind of feeling that, you know, that I counted as someone, that I wasn't just someone in the background . . . that someday, somebody would notice me for being the quiet person that I was" (p. 141). Susan connected the need to be important to others with her desire to teach and with the legacy she wanted to leave behind: "It makes me feel good to be needed and maybe that's why I want to teach so much, because I want to be able to give help . . . I want to be the kind of teacher that the kids will remember" (p. 4).

Despite her growing confidence, Susan depended greatly on others for assurance. Flattered that Bob had chosen her as a student teacher, she worried about making a good impression on him. Susan, who was accustomed to getting straight A's, wanted everything to be perfect right from the start.

The Story and Its Turning Points

Phase one: Deciding to get tough. At the end of the first week of student teaching, Susan announced: "I'm going to have trouble with discipline." She had sized up her cooperating teacher and decided that he might be "good at explaining things," but he was not a good model for her in the area of discipline. "He's too laissez-faire. He lets the kids talk and move around when he's talking, but I want stricter ground rules" (p. 83). Susan knew that the students respected Bob even though they sometimes went to the bathroom or their lockers and sharpened pencils while he was talking. Still, she measured their respect for her by their willingness to listen attentively and follow her directions. Throughout student teaching Susan maintained that being short, female, and soft-spoken put her at a disadvantage compared to Bob who was a tall male.

Taking over a reading group, Susan worked hard to prepare homemade dittos which she claimed were "more meaningful" than the regular workbook pages. For example, she had students find two- and three-syllable words in a newspaper to fill in the blanks of a ditto she had prepared on syllabification. But Susan had trouble getting her group of 11 boys to cooperate and often confused her inability to pace the lesson or attend to individual differences with their unwillingness to comply. Once, after asking everyone to wait for instructions, 3 boys completed a ditto before she was finished explaining it. Rather than consider the appropriateness of the assignment or the need to have additional work on hand, Susan got upset about what she saw as the students' lack of respect.

Another time, after the class had seen a film on different kinds of graphs (e.g., bar graphs, line graphs), Susan asked the students to find a graph in the newspaper and tell a little about it. Susan considered this a good idea because students would be working with information they had derived from a source other than a textbook. "I thought it would be a great idea, use newspapers, no books, actually have them searching for these things and interpreting what the graphs meant" (p. 109). The students, however, could not make sense of graphs about gold prices or the Dow Jones average. One girl burst into tears of frustration. Seeing that the task was too hard for fourth graders, Susan changed her strategy when she taught the third graders, asking them to make up their own graphs. She was greatly relieved that Bob had not been in the classroom to see "the big disaster" (p. 110).

When her science supervisor came to observe, Susan expected comments on her science teaching. Instead, the supervisor focused on her management and checked "needs improvement" in all categories of the observation form. Later that day, Susan told the interviewer that the science supervisor had

recommended three studies on classroom management for her to read. Susan felt discouraged: "I want to be a miracle teacher. I want to do it right, right away" (p. 53). Her discomfort seemed to provide an impetus for change. With encouragement from her fiance and cooperating teacher, she decided "to be tough. No more nice Ms. T. I have to get respect and compliance" (p. 52).

Phase two: Taking charge. Susan took over the class, announcing: "I'm going to be your teacher for the next seven weeks, so I want you to listen. I'm not going to talk over you" (p. 56). Bob was absent frequently and even the substitutes looked to Susan for directions. Now Susan took action more quickly. She kept individual students in at recess, turned off the lights, stopped a game when there was too much noise, made students put their heads down on their desks. Still, she continued to be concerned about getting enough respect.

During this second phase, Susan also tried out various instructional activities, succeeding most in areas in which she had some specific preparation. In science, for example, Susan taught a unit on polar coordinates from the SCIS (Science Curriculum Improvement Study) unit because this was the curriculum Bob used and because she wanted "to see what it was like." For the most part, she followed the suggestions in the teacher's guide. She did, however, transform a pencil-and-paper exercise from the materials into a "concrete" activity by having students go out to the playground and pretend they were navigators locating objects at sea. Working with the SCIS materials, Susan saw firsthand what her science methods professor meant when he criticized the curriculum for being "activity-driven:"

> SCIS I found was basically directed towards doing the activities and it was just assumed that the children would understand the concept behind it. It was never spelled out or given. . . . And although the activities were very enjoyable, I don't think

> SCIS in itself . . . was sufficient for what I would want to teach. (p. 97)

Because she had a framework for thinking about SCIS, Susan was more aware of its strengths and limitations and was better able to adapt it for student learning.

In her higher ability reading group, Susan followed Bob's suggestion and planned a unit on elements of fiction (plot, character, setting, point of view). Although she had majored in English, Susan seemed to have a limited understanding of these terms. Asked for a definition of plot, she said, "It's the action, one thing leads to another" (p. 73). Susan was particularly pleased with her strategy for teaching the concept of character which she got from her children's literature textbook. Using the format of a radio interview, she developed a set of interview questions (e.g., What is your name? Where do you live? What do you do?) The students were supposed to fill in the names of the main character in their story and answer the questions as the character would. The reading supervisor criticized some of her lessons for being "too abstract," meaning that the students were learning to apply definitions without using the concepts to get inside their story. Susan defended herself by saying that the students were "bored by workbooks and basals" and that she was attempting to challenge them (p. 73).

Whereas Susan was able to move the class through various lessons, applying sanctions when necessary, she rarely probed student responses or made explicit connections between the activities students were doing and the concepts they were supposed to be learning. For example, one day Susan tried a mathematics activity called "Mystery Pumpkins," designed to foster logical reasoning. Given a series of clues, students were to deduce the answer to a puzzle ("Which pumpkin?"). Susan put the problem on the overhead. She read each clue and called on students to give the answers. When a student gave a

wrong answer, she called on someone else. She did not ask students to justify their answers, right or wrong, nor did she solicit discussion about the thinking entailed in the task. Although Susan felt that she had taught a lesson on problem solving, she missed the central point of focusing on students' thinking.

At midterm, Bob said she was doing fine in every area. His only suggestion was that she wait a bit longer before plunging into lessons so that the students had time to quiet down. Otherwise, he said, she was "well prepared, capable, in charge, punctual." Susan felt elated and focused on her teacher's positive evaluation rather than on the more critical feedback from her university supervisors who had pointed out areas for improvement in management and in the teaching of subject matter.

Phase three: Marking time. After receiving this positive midterm evaluation from her cooperating teacher, Susan seemed to lose interest in student teaching as a source of learning. She had done the things she wanted to do and said that if, for some reason, she could not continue, she would feel that she had accomplished her goals (p. 72). Her twin sister was about to be married and Susan confessed that she took that weekend off without taking any of her books, even though she had to go to school on Monday morning by 7:30 to prepare.

Susan also acknowledged that she was relying on dittos and workbooks, even though this conflicted with her image of a good teacher. She said it would take enormous time and commitment to prepare appropriate exercises for all the children (p. 75). And Susan continued to worry about discipline and getting respect.

Furthermore, Susan did not feel she had developed her relationship with Bob or increased her capacity to learn from him. At the beginning of student

teaching, the class had gone on a field trip to the planetarium and Susan had watched Bob extend the experience through a class project on the Big Dipper. At the end of student teaching, Susan planned a field trip to the local public television station. At Bob's suggestion, she even attended an inservice workshop on learning to use video equipment. Nevertheless she saw the trip as an end in itself and not as an impetus for further learning.

By contrast, Bob had a lot of ideas about how to use the trip to motivate worthwhile classroom work, yet, he did not tell Susan about his ideas. When she asked him what to write on the permission form under "Purpose of the Trip," he said, "community resources enrichment." After the trip, Bob surprised Susan by teaching students how to use video equipment so that they could film interviews with each other. Watching the interviews, students not only saw the importance of lighting but also came to appreciate the challenge of interviewing someone who gave one-word answers. Bob planned to have students interview each other about their family histories and also videotape their tutoring in the kindergarten. Whereas Susan claimed that she had learned "how to plan field trips with an educational purpose," she still seemed to believe that the destination determined the educative value of a trip. She contrasted "educational" field trips to the planetarium and television studio with a trip to the circus which she had taken as an elementary student (p. 81).

Right up to the end of student teaching Susan was concerned about getting enough respect from children. She sought the advice of a friend from home, a veteran teacher of 11 years:

> I don't have the respect that I think I need. I can say "Stay in for recess," but I don't feel that's going to be sufficient because it doesn't teach them anything. . . . Even though I don't want to be a heavy punisher, there needs to be some kind of reminder or something about what they had done wrong. (p. 120)

The teacher suggested that Susan have students write sentences reminding them of their misdeeds. When Bob was not around, Susan followed this advice, asking students to write "I will not disturb the class" or "I will listen when Ms. T. talks" (p. 120).

While Susan's concerns about getting compliance and respect never abated, she did clarify and alter her ideas about what good classroom management entails. She used to think that she could simply tell students what to do: "I had no idea when I first started. I assumed I could tell the kids to sit down and be quiet and they would, but you can't. Kids aren't like that" (p. 112).

Susan said that being responsible for keeping 25 students occupied showed her the importance of having enough activities for students to do and of being prepared for those students who finish early: "You can't just have one lesson and expect all the kids to go through it at the same rate" (p. 114). Susan connected this insight to a lesson she had learned from babysitting--keeping children busy is a good way to control them. Susan's thoughts about management echoed the one lecture that the Academic Program presented on the topic before student teaching. The instructor had emphasized that management is a combination of many different elements, not simply a matter of being the authority. Susan summarized the instructor's message:

> It's a combination of having yourself prepared, having all the materials you need, being organized, knowing how you're going to present it, what order things will come in, having things that the kids will understand that build on something that they already know or that build on the lesson itself (p. 114).

Prideful Occasion

Of all the things Susan did during student teaching, she was most proud of her book-making project. Susan said the project was worthwhile because it was "something out of the ordinary," which to her meant "not related to work

in basal readers." She thought that having students make their own books would also motivate them to write. "We made the books first before we wrote the story," she explained. "That way they saw a need to fill in these pages. There were all these blank pages; this beautiful book was all theirs and they could put anything in it they want" (p. 105).

Book Making. To initiate the project, Susan had students write letters to their parents saying that they would be making books in their reading class and asking if they could bring a piece of material for the cover. One mother volunteered to sew the pages together for all the books. Then, an entire school day was devoted to cutting cardboard, ironing the material on to the cover, and putting the books together. Since she had made books twice before--in her children's literature class and in her reading practicum--Susan felt confident about the procedure. Though eager, the children spent much time chatting and standing around, waiting for Susan or Bob to help them. Afterward Susan admitted, "They should have had another assignment to do, but they were all pretty excited cutting out their material and getting their books together" (p. 108).

Story Writing. Once the books were made, Susan told the students that they could write anything they wanted "as long as it has an idea behind it." Without explaining what this requirement meant or giving examples, Susan changed the formula, saying: "Every story has a problem and a solution." To illustrate this point, Susan tried using a "story starter." She gave the class a story title, "The Day I Was a Popsicle", and together they thought up problem situations that a popsicle could get into and then figured out solutions. It was not clear how this technique, which Susan had picked up in her children's literature course, fit with her vague advice about story structure or her injunction that stories have ideas.

While Susan was competent in the book-making process, she did not structure the writing phase of her project for purposes of student learning. Students worked on their stories in class and at home without getting criticism or advice. There was no discussion about problems and solutions in the stories or any effort to identify and clarify the students' ideas. Spelling was the only standard applied to the final product and even here Susan turned the responsibility over to the students:

> I wanted them to work together to check each other's stories. Again that's something they hadn't done too often, so they would skim through it and say "OK" and hand it back and there were still spelling errors . . . but it was a start anyway with working together and correcting each other. (p. 106)

Before all the students had finished their stories, Susan was ready to turn the class back to Bob. One day during her last week of student teaching, Susan sat at a table in the back of the room writing out the directions for making books which the teacher had requested. As far as she was concerned, the project was over.

Bob, however, saw a way to treat the students as authors. He moved to the front of the room and told those who had finished to put their books on a side table so that others could read them. Meanwhile, he invited one of the students to come sit beside him and read his story aloud. During the reading, Bob noticed a misspelling and sent the student to the dictionary saying, "This is really great, but can we make it better?" Later Susan explained that he had said to her: "Today why don't we take time out and just you and I will spend time correcting and reading the kids' books and showing them that we're excited and we care" (p. 106).

Susan had focused on the technique of book making rather than the process of story writing. Though Susan was proud of "doing her own thing," she did not seem to recognize the possibilities for important academic learning.

Only the classroom teacher saw the opportunity to treat students as authors who could improve their craft and their stories as pieces of writing that others could enjoy.

The Case of Molly

Goals and Expectations

Molly looked forward to student teaching but did so calmly. While the experience itself would not be new, there would be more of it. The Decision-Making Program had provided her with many and varied classroom experiences, which she expected to build on: "I see the learning as a building on what I already know. I see it as a practice time, not as something totally new. . . . There will be some stuff that is new, but most of it, I see as building" (I-7, pp. 11-12).[5] Molly stressed that she was not worried about handling students or relating to a teacher because she had already done these things (p. 16).

In one sense, student teaching seemed like one more hoop to jump through. Molly compared it to working in a hotel kitchen before one becomes a chef. Still, Molly expected to benefit from the experience:

> My requirements will be more. I'll be in contact for more time during the day with the kids, I'll be communicating more with the teacher. I'll be expected to follow through on a lot of different kinds of things, keep in contact with more of a variety of people, such as the principal. . . . I see an expanded role. (I-7, p. 11)

She wanted to find out about the children in her classroom, and "to be their friends" for a while.

Although expanding the scope and amount of her interactions to a larger time frame was important to Molly, she had one "knowledge use" goal for

---

[5]I indicates interview numbers.

student teaching. She hoped to bring together all the things she had learned in her program from all the different sources--classroom experiences, ideas and concepts from courses. To Molly, being able "to put it all together" was the test of what she really knew. In this sense, student teaching was a culminating experience.

"Putting things together" had been a goal and personal concern for Molly from the start. She knew that she was somewhat slow at that and she devoted time between quarters and during the summer to work toward this goal. Molly realized that one cannot easily use knowledge wisely. She commented in an interview at the beginning of her program:

> You're taught all this stuff and you want to use it so desperately--"I know this thing and I want to use it!" But the thing is, you're not really using it as you should. You're--you're overusing it. I want to use it in the right proportion and at the right time. (I-1, p. 15)

In the same interview Molly also explained what she regarded as the crucial principle of curriculum and instruction: What is taught should already be of interest to children and should, in turn, be applicable to the "real world."

Program Influences

In Molly's program, the principle of interest and real-world application was operationalized as "meaningfulness" and "out-of-school application." Both categories appeared on the evaluation forms used throughout the program. One form, called "Instructional Discussion Observation and Data Collection" had the following category for supervisors to check under "Focus on Learners": "It [discussion] draws out and integrates students' relevant, personal experience in order to reach the goal by way of a route that is meaningful to students" (p. 13). Another form, called "Science Inquiry Lesson Observation and Data Collection," listed among the categories to be

checked under "Lesson Closure": "Where students might use the learning [application/transfer]" (p. 12).

The Decision-Making Program stressed the importance of planning and required regular planning times for student teachers, who were expected to use detailed, specific formats to write lesson plans for different curricular areas. Molly simplified these formats for reading and math and used them every day. She told an interviewer:

> I had to put a picture on my plans to help motivate me to look at them. I put a book on the form that I use for reading and a price tag on the form that I use for math lessons. (p. 70)

Molly's goals for her own learning were compatible with her program's emphasis on "knowledge use" and "teacher decision making." They also fit with what Martha, her program director, judged she needed to work on during student teaching. In looking at some of Molly's plans, Martha was concerned that Molly was not making enough connections in teaching content, especially between making what she taught fit into a "larger picture" and identifying relationships among the things that she was teaching (p. 93). Whereas Molly was observed frequently, she had different supervisors, some newcomers to the program staff. Molly thought that "they know what I did but not really <u>how</u> I did it" (p. 154). She considered herself and her cooperating teacher as the principle sources for evaluation.

<u>Molly the Person</u>

Molly had always written goals for herself, taking pains to figure out what she wanted to achieve as well as what she was actually learning from a class or summer employment, for example. She seemed serious and mature, but was also vivacious and spontaneous. Molly had a capacity for becoming interested in things and enjoying them. Moreover, she had dramatic talents and a knack for working with visual aids.

In her program, Molly had a reputation for being "creative" and her "own person." The program director had hoped that Molly's cooperating teacher would support her in these areas of personal strength. During student teaching, however, Martha was concerned that what was "different" in Molly would be "squashed," and thought, "I hope she lives through this term" (p. 94). These worries were understandable, given the setting in which Molly taught.

Setting and Cooperating Teacher

The halls of Harrison School were light, clean, and cheerfully decorated with children's pictures and artifacts. Walking down the halls, one rarely heard a sound. Built approximately 20 years ago to allow for teaming and flexibility, the school had 34% minority children. The current staff was a closely knit group; the newest teacher had been at Harrison for nine years. Teachers worked together in teams for grades K-2 and 3-5. The teachers shared expectations about student behavior which they took care to enforce in a number of settings (halls, classrooms, library).

The opening exercises for the lower grades took place in the "addition" (a large room used for different purposes) and demonstrate the ethos of the school and the camaraderie among the teachers. Four classes gathered each morning at 8:40 a.m. for about 20 minutes to take attendance, collect milk money, mark the calendar, and say the Pledge of Allegiance. Teachers took turns supervising these activities. The children had to sit up straight, with their feet on the floor, look at the teacher talking to them--usually over a microphone--refrain from talking or moving about, and enter and leave the room in single file. Reprimands were frequent, often personal, and sometimes sharp.

Although she disagreed at times with other teachers, Suzy, Molly's cooperating teacher, did not want "to rock the boat." According to Molly, Suzy did not like the playground rules at Harrison: Girls got ropes for jumping and boys got balls to play in teams. Girls were told to walk like "little ladies" and boys like "little gentlemen" (p. 53). Still, Suzy did not want to say something "because of the team; it doesn't seem worth it" (p. 79). She expressed her belief that "the kids need tightening up" (p. 29) in the formula: "A good listener is someone who sits tall with their feet flat on the floor, looking at the person who's talking" (p.19).

Regarding the knowledge side of teaching, Suzy tended to follow the maxim "one and only one right answer". One day she gave directions for a seatwork assignment which involved choosing the right word from the list ("went," "want," "where," and "what") and putting it in a blank on a ditto. She directed students to read the sentences on the blackboard, trying every word until they found the one that made sense. As they moved through choices for the sentence, "I _____ to read a book," they came to the word "went." "Do you think that's the best choice?" asked the teacher. There was a pause. Suzy said, "Probably not," and the children all joined in and said "No" (p. 19).

A skillful manager, Suzy was good at keeping things moving and monitoring the class; a look or word from her often quieted the class down. Molly was greatly impressed by her ability to anticipate what might happen and her ability to step in immediately when things got out of hand:

> One thing that really struck me was that "thinking ahead." I think ahead but I'm more slow to act and with her zipping, and zipping and bopping, I was like "Oh, wow, I would have never gotten those things." (p. 187)

The Story: The Power of the Setting to Develop Molly's Different Teaching Personas

Socialization. Molly was a student teacher for 15 weeks--from the last week of August to the first week of December. The goals of her cooperating teacher, which fit with the school ethos of control, loomed large in Molly's experience. At the beginning of the school year, Suzy gave a lot of attention to "grooving" her second graders, expecting them to sit still and upright with their eyes on the teacher, to listen attentively. She was concerned that children follow directions correctly when given.

Suzy spent time and effort at the beginning of the day and during transition periods to bring children to order and attention. To achieve these goals, she talked very slowly in a flat, monotonous voice. Before going to the library, for instance, Suzy said to the children, "I want you to know that I don't want one single sound." Children were sitting, heads down, at their desks. She continued, pointing to several of them, "I want these people to show what a nice job you can do standing in line. If I see you running, I will lose my patience" (p. 51). In Suzy's classroom, access to the toilet, the water fountain, and the pencil sharpener were strictly controlled, and children who talked more than once during a spelling test got "zeros". Curriculum and instruction were highly standardized at the beginning of the year, based on dittos, drills, and workbooks. Suzy grouped children for instruction by the comparative speed with which they completed workbook assignments.

Molly assumed the teacher's goals: "They need this," she said (p. 28). "The teacher wants to work on this" (p. 32). When asked during the second week of student teaching what she watched when observing Suzy, Molly replied, "I'm watching to see how she gets the kids to be good listeners" (p. 28). The following week she responded that she was learning a great deal about

management, which Molly had come to see as her major problem (p. 35).

Molly rapidly took on an equal share of the classroom routines in math drills, spelling tests, and reading skill instruction. In these instructional contexts, Molly developed a "teacherish persona." Tight-lipped, robot-like, often yawning, Molly seemed bland and authoritarian. Because she spoke very slowly, there was little evidence of thinking or involvement on her part. At times, an unpleasant note crept into what she said. Once, while Molly tried to get the class ready for spelling, two boys haggled over an eraser. "This is not the time to settle it," Molly insisted, but the boys did not stop even when she repeated herself:

> This is not the time to settle it. My spelling test isn't on Friday, yours is. Daniel, head down. I will not wait that long next time; you'll be sitting here with your heads down for five minutes during recess. (p. 46)

Amiable with one another, the two teachers seemed at times to be allied against the children. With the class in the library, Molly and Suzy had a cozy chat about a play based on "Three Billy Goats Gruff," which one reading group had practiced that morning. Suzy remarked to Molly, in the same slow and wooden manner that the children had used: "Now this play is not going to get any better than it is . . . so we'll put it on this afternoon" (pp. 51-52). Both teachers laughed. They did not realize that the children were speaking as they were spoken to.

Despite this camaraderie, Molly's novice status stood out clearly to the students. She had difficulty getting compliance and attending to more than one classroom situation at a time. She often told the children to pay attention, or said that she would wait, or that they were not doing what they were supposed to be doing. Given all her classroom experiences in the Decision-Making Program and her specific preparation in management, Molly was surprised and aggravated to find that the children were testing her and that

she had difficulties controlling them. Molly reverted to strategies that were discouraged in her program but were customary at Harrison School where teachers raised their voices and punished children by giving "time out" from instruction. She explained that she was "following the teacher" in management technique because what Suzy did was "effective" and the "kids were used to it" (p. 185).

Molly also had difficulties dealing with the knowledge side of teaching. When she introduced homemade spelling dittos for "enrichment", her explanations were not helpful. Decorated with "word pizzas," these dittos were harder than the spelling lesson and their format was confusing. For example, one of them required students to unscramble nonsense words like "stla," "tna," "cta," and "dnah," and place them into appropriate categories according to the "word pizzas". Many children seemed unable to read the word "unscramble," figure out what they were supposed to do, or follow Molly's repeated directions (pp. 22-23).

Difficulties of this sort went unnoticed. Suzy observed Molly in management and gave her advice in that area. Although she thought it too advanced for "these children," Suzy allowed Molly to read Charlotte's Web, and the class was thrilled by her dramatic, exciting delivery. The teacher told Molly that "she had flunked in management." Still, Suzy had confidence in her student teacher, thought Molly a wonderful reader, and loved having her in the room (p. 46).

Self-assertion. Six weeks into the school year, classroom work became more diverse and interactions more relaxed, even though Suzy's concerns for curbing and controlling students never disappeared. Molly improved in classroom management. She was learning to monitor the rest of the class while working with individual students or a small group. The children continued to

test her, but she carried on. Molly felt that the teacher had shifted attention from her improvement to a shared focus on children (p. 55). Desks side-by-side, the teachers planned and administered classroom life.

In small but significant ways, Molly asserted herself. Grouping children for a game, she said "Instead of separating the boys and girls, I'd like people with blonde hair over here, brown hair over here" (p. 45). Molly was struck by the unequal treatment of boys and girls on the playground and found it frustrating to watch. Nor did she like the fact that, at Harrison, there were, "Unwritten rules about speech, behavior, how little girls talk, how little boys walk. Boys get a lot more attention but they also get to hear the harsher voices," she exclaimed, "all the research--it's true!" (p. 57). Molly stressed that she had noticed these patterns because of her social foundations course, which had focused on problems of equity in teaching.

When circumstances allowed, Molly used her own voice in management, and her voice reflected her program's view that management and instruction should not be separated. One day, for example, both Suzy and Molly taught art in the school's addition. Molly was cutting and gluing pumpkins with one group; Suzy was having children paint pumpkins on black paper. Whereas Molly started with instruction at the outset and permitted children to handle the materials, Suzy made children put back the brushes they had seized eagerly and ordered them to sit quietly, feet flat on the floor. Molly's voice was friendly; children made comments, talked and shuffled around. On the other side of the room, Suzy quelled all noise and commotion by giving directions in a robot-like voice, insisting, "I want everyone to be very controlled" (pp. 77-78).

Molly was not happy giving skill instruction "when kids can't immediately see the application" (p. 53) and she felt free enough to state her view that

children were "skilled to death in reading." She did not see why students who could read well should continue to have skill instruction and she compared this to knowing how to ride a bike and then being told, "Now, get off the bike, and I'll teach you how to pedal" (p. 71).

This may explain why Molly's "teacherish persona" persisted in spelling tests and reading skill instruction. One typical 20-minute lesson contained silent story reading, recall questions, choral reading of unconnected sentences, base word recognition, and practice in the "qu" sound (pp. 49-51). While Molly followed the teacher's guide and mirrored Suzy, who was teaching the same lesson to a second group, she felt exasperated about these lessons:

> They throw in structure, sight, phonetics, it's all thrown in. First they do prefixes, then there are vowels thrown in. . . . It's just like a thousand shots in the hopes that one will hit. Where are their minds? (p. 71)

In her own classroom, Molly said she would first find out what the children know, spend "a couple of minutes" on skills, and then go on to comprehension, preferably using library books. She would test children to find out what kinds of learners they are, then group them accordingly.

In general, Molly wanted to add "quality": "Think about things more, improve, try to make them [children] think more instead of just getting through" (p. 71). She tried to do this in mathematics by using chip trading to teach place value. Molly acted the part of a friendly banker. Yet when laying down the basic rules, she did not make a distinction between those bearing on behavior and those bearing on mathematics: "(a) When you have 10 yellow chips, you get a blue chip. (b) Roll your dice on the board and not on the table" (p. 138).

When Molly asked questions like, "Why are these chips worth 60, and not 6?," the children gave answers that sounded like a restatement of her

question: "Because they're worth more" or, "Because it's 60 cents" (p. 138). Without probing what the children meant by the answers she accepted at face value, Molly could not know whether they had grasped the key point that each chip was worth more, in fact, 10 times more. Still, Molly "felt comfortable" teaching the concept in this way and thought that the children "were real comfortable learning it" (p. 183). Suzy was impressed, and Molly proudly told an interviewer that she was teaching Suzy and an aide how to do chip trading (p. 70).

Having participated together in an inservice workshop, Molly and Suzy teamed up to introduce a writing program in which teachers acted as consultants and children wrote stories on topics that interested them, without worrying about spelling and punctuation. There were regular conferences in which teachers helped children develop their ideas and acted as critics. Students read each other's stories and commented on them.

Such ideas were new to Suzy, who worried about managing the program properly, but this innovation allowed Molly to work in ways that were more natural to her. Molly elicited children's ideas and talked to them with evident pleasure and ease. Many students showed considerable capacity for thought and imagination, and even Suzy was surprised at how much she was learning about their ways of thinking (p. 114).

Counting the days. Molly was "working hard and enjoying it," but at the same time she was "counting the days." In October, she announced, "There are four more weeks until Thanksgiving, and then it's downhill" (p. 71).

True to her prediction, Molly went into a holding pattern after Thanksgiving. She explained that student teaching had been very long and that she was very tired. Almost from the beginning, she had been taking attendance in

the addition for 85 children each morning, and she wearily recited her daily responsibilities:

> Getting them [the class] down to the room, getting them quieted down, explaining their reading work, meeting with them in writing, transitioning to math . . . explaining directions, getting them down to the addition, getting them out of the door, I say "Out you go!" Watching them come down from the hall as they get back from lunch, making sure they're walking. Taking attendance again in the afternoon, getting them down to the room again, getting them to quiet down, ready for reading, doing their reading strategy lesson with them, getting them lined up for science or social studies . . . and throughout this whole thing, you know, figuring things out in my head, "How much do I have left for _____?" and, "Should I change that?" (pp. 175-176)

It "required a lot of effort to get mentally up for teaching now," and Molly wished "it were all over" (p. 157).

Suzy felt that classroom management was coming apart and began to intervene as she had done in the early phase of student teaching. During a lesson on vowels and consonants, Suzy felt that the children in Molly's group were getting "really out of hand." When Suzy questioned Molly whether she knew where she was going in the lesson, Molly responded curtly that she did (p. 158). Molly kept saying, "It's so busy; there's so much to do," and Suzy wondered whether she should remind Molly that she had only done <u>half</u> of the teaching, <u>half</u> of the grading (p. 158).

Nevertheless, her cooperating teacher was extremely enthusiastic about Molly's teaching and did not want her to leave student teaching with negative feelings. According to Suzy, the director of the Decision-Making Program took credit for Molly's many successes, but Suzy concluded, "Molly's a natural, a real colleague, and a joy to have around." As a fitting momento, all Decision-Making Program student teachers were presented with an engraved whistle--"Harrison School 1984"--by the staff.

Molly's Prideful Occasion

Molly was most herself when teaching an elections unit she had developed. She thought that children should know about the presidential elections as an important current event. She used social studies to expand their vocabulary with "words they would probably be seeing again," "words that they probably see in a newspaper or hear people talking about" (p. 125). The unit was also important to Molly because, "If I create it, I tend to be more motivated and directed, and the kids sense this and they meet my expectations" (p. 70).

How Molly planned the project. Molly put time and thought into planning her unit. To decide on content, she drew on her everyday knowledge. This is illustrated by the vocabulary words and definitions which she created "out of her own head" (pp. 123-124). For instance, she defined "power" as "when you can do things your way"; "voting" as "giving your support"; "opinion" as "what you yourself believe" (p. 79). She assumed that children would be interested in the fact that the president must be a U.S. citizen, be at least 35 years old, that he earned $200,000 a year, and could do, as Molly put it, "whatever he wanted." She also thought that children ought to know about "gimmicks" for swaying opinions, such as television commercials, buttons, signs, and radio announcements.

Aiming for a tangible outcome to give her a sense of completion and to help the children remember what they had studied, Molly decided to have the children make a book with a ditto sheet for every lesson:

> It was important for me to give them something they could take home, that was something in their hand; this knowledge, floating around up there, it's in a book, and it's in an order kind of book, and it's in the same order that we covered it, and that should help their recall. (p. 125)

The dittos, for instance, required coloring the American flag and matching words to definitions.

For every lesson, Molly wrote out vocabulary words, objectives, and an abbreviated script. Her plan for the lesson on voting had these words at the top: vote, voting, booth, ballot, vote count, wrap-up. As objectives, Molly listed the following: students would be able to state that the opinions of the candidates determined how they voted and that their vote was private and a matter of choice. Her script was a combination of things to do (count the votes; review opinions) and things to say, ("You have a decision;" "It's time for you to vote"). Molly came up with the idea of using puppets (President Richard and Mr. Martin) for candidates and picked "issues" that she thought would be meaningful to the children (e.g., the lunch menu, recess). She realized that what she was teaching about presidential elections was simplified and not true to reality. Still, she believed the students could transfer what they learned to other elections (p. 126).

Molly as "her own person." On the last day of the sequence, Molly reviewed her lesson plans during lunch and commented that it was hard to keep everything straight and to remember everything she was going to do (p. 62). When it was time to start the lesson, she pretended that one of the puppets, President Richard, was calling, "Hey, take us out of the closet." Going over to a cupboard, she took the puppet out, saying "Hello everybody." The children called back, "Hi, President Richard." The puppet said, "I hope you'll vote for me." When Molly got the other puppet out, the children greeted it, "Hi, we are going to vote for you."

Launching into the lesson, Molly said, "I think we should go over our opinions on the issues. After all, the way you vote is because of what you think about the issues." Then, through a combination of recall questions to

the children--"Can anyone remember what President Richard said about recess?"--and queries to the puppets themselves, she elicited their positions, and recorded them on the board.

The children were noisy and excited, and Molly interjected a few warnings. "I can't talk over people. Robert, go to the other side of the room. You know how to behave. Sam, you have your warning. Does anyone know what the word 'votes' means?" One girl said, "If you pick one person and they are 35, that means you vote." Molly let this confused response pass and put down the right answer: "Vote is the way you support the candidate."

Now it was time to vote. Molly said, "I am looking for two people with good behavior who can go to the voting booth. Who knows what a voting booth is?" She wrote the definition on the board: "Voting booth is where you vote." Then she pantomimed stepping into a booth, closing the curtains, and stepping out. "A ballot," she explained, "is on what you vote." Molly distributed the remaining ditto sheets for the elections booklet. While the class worked on them, she took two children at a time to the voting booth she had set up in the listening center (p. 67). In the end, Molly ran out of time and asked the children to put their books together at home.

Afterward Molly considered what she would have to do differently in the future so that the booklets could be completed and the activities in her elections unit would go more smoothly. What happened during her elections unit stood in vivid contrast to much of the school work in this classroom, bringing Molly and the students to life. Watching her performance, Suzy commented spontaneously: "Isn't she fun to watch?" (p. 77).

What Do the Cases Show?

Looking back on these stories, one can compare what student teachers hoped for as they approached student teaching and what actually happened; how

persons, program, and settings interacted to shape the experience; and how the realities of student teaching--its experiential quality and placement at the end of formal preparation--created significant impressions on Molly and Susan. Personal meaning, however, is not inconsistent with mislearning, Molly's and Susan's student teaching experiences were no exception.

The Test of Reality

Student teaching did not meet Molly's expectations. Having taken for granted her capacities concerning the interactive side of teaching, she found that she had many of the problems other student teachers have. The children tested Molly, and she had difficulty getting their attention and compliance. To her surprise, she had to put effort into learning how to manage Suzy's class.

Contrary to her hopes, Molly had limited opportunities to synthesize all she had learned in her formal preparation. Instead, she received an intensive and lengthy induction into the "daily grind" of schooling. Thus, the experience proved to be a test for her as a novice but failed to be the culminating test of what she knew as a teacher. Though understandable, Molly's hope reveals a limited view of practical knowledge in teaching and shows how views of teaching grow and change over time.

In contrast, Susan's expectations were largely met. She found out what it was like to be responsible for a class and she concluded that she could "handle it." Even though Susan never got the level of respect she wanted, she succeeded in taking charge. Thus she passed the personal test that student teaching represented for her.

In teaching subject matter, Susan did the things she had hoped to do--plan and teach in several curricular areas over time. Up to a point, she also succeeded in doing what she had written about in her student teaching

application--putting aside the basal and using the community as a resource. Lacking a sense of what she needed to learn to foster her students' understanding, she was satisfied that she had the experiences she wanted.

Interaction of Factors in the Experience

Susan's personal capacities and concerns set the boundaries for learning from student teaching. Drawing on a new-found confidence developed in personal relationships and work, Susan decided to take a hard line with the class. Her basic insecurity came through, however, when she continued to worry about not getting enough respect from her students. The need for personal recognition helped motivate the book-making project. But the potential of the project as a worthwhile learning experience for teacher and children was curtailed by Susan's limited understanding of story writing and its pedagogy.

Susan worked to realize her ideal of a good teacher, one who combines skillful management with learning activities that are "fun." Based on teachers she admired from her past, this ideal had been extended by what she had learned in the Academic Program. Whereas Susan came to student teaching with foundational knowledge of teaching and learning, she did not know how to connect this knowledge to pedagogical thinking and acting.

Although the classroom setting did not impede Susan, it did not offer the necessary structure for learning. Susan had a great deal of responsibility and latitude. She did not have to perpetuate practices that conflicted with her personal views or with those of her program. In fact, her cooperating teacher was an exemplary teacher of academic subjects. But because Susan did not see Bob as a model and because he did not act as a teacher educator, she had little opportunity to learn from him.

In Molly's experience, the setting dominated. Against her nature and the messages of her program, she adopted a "teacherish persona" consonant with the school. In instructional activities typical for the setting, Molly mirrored her cooperating teacher's bland and authoritarian comportment. This compliance came at a cost: The pervasive ethos of control left its marks on children and on Molly. When circumstances allowed, Molly asserted herself, drawing on her personal talents, everyday knowledge and the ideas she had learned in the Decision-Making Program. Employing strategies from a social foundations class, she departed from the sexism of Harrison school. She simplified the program's planning formats and motivated herself to write daily lesson plans involving objectives, scripts, and behaviors.

Molly's knack for visuals, drama, and impersonation were prominent when she did "her own thing." Using puppets to relate the presidential election to children's lives, she was engaged and engaging in the activity. Doing things she believed in, such as chip trading and writing conferences, she was warm and attentive. In the interplay of setting, person, and program, Molly changed personas as she moved through different instructional contexts. The tension between socialization and self-assertion, played out in these different contexts, set limits on her learning.

Lessons of Experience and Their Limits

Despite differences in the amount of prior classroom experience, both Molly and Susan learned how hard it can be for a novice to take charge of someone else's classroom. Children recognize a lack of experience and behave accordingly; student teachers do not know (and may not like) the operating system of their classroom placement.

Being in charge and having to keep 25 students occupied showed Susan the value of setting limits and dealing with management through instructional

planning that considers individual differences. She also saw how much time and effort that takes. Molly assumed that she already had teaching and management skills. When the children were difficult to handle, she imitated Suzy who was skilled at pacing and monitoring the class but preoccupied with control.

As for the knowledge side of teaching, both Molly and Susan were on their own during student teaching, and they succeeded within the limited understandings and skills they brought to student teaching. Molly's election unit showed that she was serious about planning and completing an activity she thought would be meaningful to children, but she lacked any grounded understanding of politics or children's interests. Her beliefs and decisions in this area went unchallenged.

While Susan's program stressed academic knowledge and teaching for understanding, she did not know how to recognize and develop possibilities for worthwhile academic learning. She was proud about <u>doing</u> what she thought were "meaningful" activities, such as going on fieldtrips or making books. Although the reading supervisor challenged some of Susan's plans, her sense that she had been "innovative" and "in charge" caused her to ignore his criticism.

From the standpoint of the central tasks of teaching and teacher preparation, Molly's and Susan's learning was systematically limited. Neither student teacher was helped to attend to pupil thinking in planning or teaching, or to clarify what counts as a worthwhile learning activity. While student teaching is not an occasion to learn subject matter, it can be an opportunity to consider the adequacy and accuracy of what one is teaching and to practice probing students' thinking to see what they are learning.

Susan may have been closer to perceiving the central tasks of teaching, but neither cooperating teacher nor university supervisors focused her

attention on the particular techniques she needed to use to accomplish her goals in practice. In some ways, Molly seemed more attuned to the purposeful, strategic aspects of pedagogical thinking, but she became saturated with "institutional activities" (Green, 1971) and received no help to further pupil understanding.

Personal Meaning and Mislearning

Because student teaching comes at the end of formal preparation and because it is experiential, it is a source of impressive, cathected learnings, regardless of the merits of the lessons learned. Both Molly and Susan felt that they had proven themselves even before student teaching was over. Not only had they stood the test of time, they seemed to have succeeded as teachers. They felt they had learned by doing. Both received glowing recommendations from their cooperating teachers. This encouraged and reinforced these misconceptions. Thus, for Molly and Susan, student teaching was more an end than a beginning.

Molly received criticism and advice only about the management side of teaching. This, coupled with Suzy's generally enthusiastic evaluation, left Molly's personal and process-oriented view of teaching undisturbed. The pedagogy of subject matter eluded her (Shulman, 1986). Susan sought outside advice about discipline and management, but placed great stock in Bob's reassuring midterm and final evaluation. In her first extended encounter with teaching, she defined her success mostly in terms of getting respect and conducting innovative activities. Yet Susan lacked the skills to clarify the point of these activities. Because student teaching has great personal meaning, surviving the experience and receiving praise from teachers have great affective salience. Compared with such "hard evidence," the rhetoric of programs carries less weight with student teachers.

When is Student Teaching Teacher Education?

Together with our framework, these stories of teacher learning during student teaching help to illustrate some answers to the question posed in the title of this paper. Student teaching is teacher education when intending teachers are moved toward a practical understanding of the central tasks of teaching; when their dispositions and skills to extend and probe student learning are strengthened; when they learn to question what they see, believe and do; when they see the limits of justifying their decisions and actions in terms of "neat ideas" or classroom control; and when they see experience as a beginning rather than a culminating point in their learning. Meeting these conditions depends on teacher educators' perceiving and acting on the central tasks of teacher preparation.

By themselves, student teachers can rarely see beyond what they want or need to do or what the classroom setting requires. Without guidance, they cannot be expected to recognize that management skills may be necessary to teach classroom groups but are certainly not sufficient for teaching content. Nor can we expect novices to probe the validity of the knowledge they have to make curriculum or question their beliefs about children's interests while they try to stay abreast of all aspects of classroom life within the constraints of someone else's classroom and their own limited expertise.

Teacher educators must be actively present in student teaching to give prospective teachers a concrete sense of pedagogical thinking and acting. As the trusted person in the setting, cooperating teachers are well positioned to induct novices into the invisible world of teaching. The job of cooperating teacher is to talk aloud about what they do and why, to demonstrate how to probe and extend student thinking, to alert student teachers to interpret

signs of understanding and confusion in pupils, to stimulate student teachers to talk about their reasons for decisions and actions and the difficulties inherent to finding out what pupils know and what they need to learn. As an outsider to the setting, the university supervisor can help the student teacher relate the specifics of the classroom to larger frames of reference such as disciplinary knowledge, societal mandates, research on teaching, a broad view of learning to teach (see Buchmann, 1984). Through "situational teaching" (Cohn, 1979), the supervisor can connect foundational knowledge to particular actions and decisions and reinforce important concepts and orientations from the program. If cooperating teachers and university supervisors do not act as teacher educators, other factors (e.g. persons, setting) will dominate, shaping what can be learned in student teaching (Griffin et al., 1983).

For student teaching to be teacher education, it must go beyond survival or extended practice in the outward forms of teaching to sort out appropriate from inappropriate lessons of experience. Well-meaning praise from cooperating teachers, coupled with a focus on management, fixes the attention of student teachers in the wrong direction. University supervisors cannot only be occasional visitors who mark observation forms; they must act in concert with cooperating teachers to make student teaching an occasion for teacher education.

The current structure of student teaching makes these goals difficult, at best, to achieve. Indeed, our case studies show how teacher learning can be limited or misdirected even with the best intentions and with some suitable preparation. For example, the case studies dramatize the failure of cooperating teachers to take seriously their roles as teacher educators. Current proposals (e.g., the Holmes Group report, 1986) to involve

experienced teachers more fully in the education of novices will miscarry unless policymakers appreciate what is required in terms of preparation and support. Just as becoming a classroom teacher involves making a transition from being a student to being a professional, becoming a mentor involves making a transition from classroom teacher to teacher educator. Classroom teachers need time and commitment to develop the necessary understandings, skills, and orientations, and schools must broaden the scope of teachers' roles and rewards to include teacher education.

References

Buchmann, M. (1984). The priority of knowledge and understanding in teaching. In L. G. Katz & J. D. Raths (Eds.), Advances in Teacher Education (Vol. 1, pp. 29-48). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cohn, M. (1979). The interrelationship of theory and practice in teacher education: A description and analysis of the Lite Program. Published doctoral dissertation. St. Louis: Washington University.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relationship of theory and practice in education. In M. Borrowman (Ed.), Teacher education in America: A documentary history. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & S. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook on teaching and policy (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. Teachers College Record, 87, 49-65.

Green, T. (1971). The activities of teaching. New York: McGraw Hill.

Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hushes, R., O'Noal S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Highet, G. (1966). The art of teaching. New York: Knopf.

Hogan, P. (1983). The central place of prejudice in the supervision of student teachers. Journal of Education for Teaching, 9, 30-45.

Holmes Group, Inc. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Education, The Holmes Group, Inc.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scheffler, I. (1985). Of human potential: An essay in the philosophy of education. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4-14.

Wilson, J. (1975). Educational theory and the preparation of teachers. Windsor, England:: NFER Publishing.

Zeichner, K. (1985, April). Content and contexts: Neglected elements in studies of student teaching as an occasion for learning to teach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.